



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/852,263	05/10/2001	Manuel Gonzalez	60006758-1	5454

7590 06/27/2005  
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

LAMB, TWYLER MARIE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2622

DATE MAILED: 06/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/852,263

Applicant(s)

GONZALEZ ET AL.

Examiner

Twyler M. Lamb

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 9-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanagami et al. (Hanagami) (US 6,687,020) in view of Gilman et al. (Gilman) (US 6,208,770).

With regard to claims 1 and 18, Hanagami discloses a method for selecting a printed image size comprising steps of: receiving an image; and selecting at least one of said image sizes in said range for printing said image (col 6, line 27 – col 8, line 53; col 19, line 59 – col 20, line 34).

Hanagami does not specifically teach calculating a range of image sizes for printing said image based on a plurality of factors.

Gilman discloses a method of producing prints that teach calculates a range of image sizes for printing said image based on a plurality of factors (col 6, lines 19-34).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Hanagami to include calculating a range of image sizes for printing said image based on a plurality of factors as taught by Gilman. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

Art Unit: 2622

have modified Hanagami by the teaching of Gilman to prepare the printed layout as taught by Gilman in col 6, lines 19-34.

With regard to claims 2, 13 and 19, Hanagami discloses further comprising steps of: receiving a user-preferred image size; and determining whether said user-preferred image size is within said range (col 6, line 27 – col 8, line 53; col 19, line 59 – col 20, line 34).

With regard to claims 3, 14 and 20, Hanagami discloses wherein said step of selecting further comprises steps of: selecting said user-preferred image size for printing said image in response to said user-preferred image size being within said range; and selecting said at least one of said image sizes in said range for printing said image in response to said user-preferred image size falling outside of said range (col 6, line 27 – col 8, line 53; col 19, line 59 – col 20, line 34).

With regard to claims 9 and 15, Hanagami discloses wherein said plurality of factors includes one or more of resolution, aspect ratio, number of pixels per inch of a printed image, and image orientation (col 6, line 27 – col 8, line 53; col 19, line 59 – col 20, line 34).

With regard to claim 10, Hanagami discloses wherein said steps in said method are performed by a program stored in a computer readable medium (col 6, line 27 – col 8, line 53; col 19, line 59 – col 20, line 34).

With regard to claims 11 and 16, Hanagami discloses wherein said calculating step further includes a step of calculating a range of image sizes for printing said image

Art Unit: 2622

on at least A3 sized paper medium (col 6, line 27 – col 8, line 53; col 19, line 59 – col 20, line 34).

With regard to claims 12 and 17, Hanagami discloses a method for printing an image comprising steps of: receiving an image; calculating a range of image sizes for printing said image based on a plurality of factors; and printing said image in a size in said range (col 6, line 27 – col 8, line 53; col 19, line 59 – col 20, line 34).

3. Claims 4-8 and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanagami et al. (Hanagami) (US 6,687,020) in view of Gilman et al. (Gilman) (US 6,208,770) and Young (US 6,587,221).

With regard to claim 4, Hanagami does not specifically teach wherein said step of calculating further comprises steps of: determining an aspect ratio of said image; and calculating said range, whereby an image printed in each of said sizes in said range has aspect ratio approximately equal to an aspect ratio of said received image.

Young discloses a scanning device that includes wherein said step of calculating further comprises steps of: determining an aspect ratio of said image; and calculating said range, whereby an image printed in each of said sizes in said range has aspect ratio approximately equal to an aspect ratio of said received image (col 10, line 54 – col 11, line 60).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Hanagami to include wherein said step of calculating further comprises steps of: determining an aspect ratio of said image; and calculating

Art Unit: 2622

said range, whereby an image printed in each of said sizes in said range has aspect ratio approximately equal to an aspect ratio of said received image as taught by Young. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Hanagami by the teaching of Young to maintain the aspect ratio as taught by Young in col 10, lines 54-65.

With regard to claim 5, Hanagami discloses wherein said step of calculating further comprises steps of: determining a resolution of said received image, determining a resolution of a printer printing said image, correlating said resolution of said received image and said printer; and calculating said sizes in said range, whereby an image printed in each of said sizes in said range has a resolution associated with said correlated resolution (col 6, line 27 – col 8, line 53; col 19, line 59 – col 20, line 34).

With regard to claim 6, Hanagami discloses wherein said step of calculating further comprises a step of calculating said sizes in said range, whereby an image printed in each of said sizes in said range has a number of pixels that is greater than a predetermined minimum number of pixels and less than a predetermined maximum number of pixels (col 6, line 27 – col 8, line 53; col 19, line 59 – col 20, line 34).

With regard to claim 7, Hanagami discloses wherein said step of calculating further comprises steps of: determining an orientation of said received image; and calculating said sizes in said range, whereby an image printed in each of said sizes in said range has said orientation of said received image (col 6, line 27 – col 8, line 53; col 19, line 59 – col 20, line 34).

With regard to claim 8, Hanagami discloses wherein said orientation includes one of landscape and portrait (col 6, line 27 – col 8, line 53; col 19, line 59 – col 20, line 34).

With regard to claim 21, Hanagami does not specifically teach wherein said interface includes a network interface.

Young discloses a scanning device that includes wherein said interface includes a network interface (col 3, lines 51-62).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Hanagami to include wherein said interface includes a network interface as taught by Young. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Hanagami by the teaching of Young to maintain the connect to a network to provide remote printing as taught by Young in col 3, lines 51-62.

With regard to claim 22, Hanagami does not specifically teach wherein said interface includes a user input device.

Young discloses a scanning device that includes wherein said interface includes a user input device (col 4, lines 19-25).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Hanagami to include wherein said interface includes a user input device as taught by Young. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Hanagami by the teaching of Young to maintain the connect to be able to input data and specifications as taught by Young in col 4, lines 19-25.

Art Unit: 2622


***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Twyler M. Lamb whose telephone number is 571-272-7406. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon, Tues and Thurs 6:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward L. Coles can be reached on 571-272-7402. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Twyler M. Lamb  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2622